

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 99-1200**

---

DANIEL JOHNSON WILLIS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

and

TAIMAK D. WILLIS; EARNSTINE BROWN; JAMES  
EDWARD RHODES,

Plaintiffs,

versus

TRENTON MEMORIAL ASSOCIATION; FRED FOSCUE, as  
President; RUTH FOSCUE, as Secretary; OTHER  
UNIDENTIFIED OFFICERS; TOWN OF TRENTON, NORTH  
CAROLINA; JOFFREE T. LEGGETT, as Mayor of Town  
Council; EDWARD EUBANKS, as Councilman; WIL-  
LARD O. LEWIS, as Councilman; CHARLES JONES,  
as Councilman; C. GLENN SPIVEY, as Town Clerk;  
JAMES R. HOOD, Law Office; JAMES R. HOOD,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

**No. 99-1201**

---

DANIEL JOHNSON WILLIS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

JAMES B. HUNT, JR., as Governor for the State of North Carolina; JIM DRENNON, as director of the Administration Office of the Courts; KENNETH TURNER, retired Judge, North Carolina Judicial System; STEPHEN WILLIAMSON, retired Judge, North Carolina Judicial System; BILLY W. WHITE, Magistrate, North Carolina Judicial System; WILLARD ODELL LEWIS; EDWARD EUBANKS; CHARLES JONES; JOFFREE T. LEGGET; CLIFTON SPIVEY; JEFF SPIVEY; RON METTS, in his official capacity as Clerk of Court,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at New Bern. Malcolm J. Howard, District Judge. (CA-95-93-H-3-4, CA-95-51-H-2-4)

---

Submitted: June 29, 1999

Decided: August 12, 1999

---

Before MURNAGHAN and ERVIN, Circuit Judges, and BUTZNER, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Daniel Johnson Willis, Appellant Pro Se. Cheryl A. Marteney, WARD & SMITH, P.A., New Bern, North Carolina; Thomas Giles Meacham, Jr., OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF NORTH CAROLINA, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Daniel Johnson Willis appeals the district court's orders dismissing his civil rights actions with prejudice. We have reviewed the records and the district court's opinion and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. See Willis v. Trenton Mem'l Ass'n, No. CA-95-93-H-3-4; Willis v. Hunt, No. CA-95-51-H-2-4 (E.D.N.C. Jan. 25, 1999). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED